

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:) Confirmation No: 9260
Paul S. Enfield)
Application No. 09/902,923) Examiner: Elaine L. Gort
Filed: July 10, 2001) Group Art Unit: 3627
For: INFORMATION, DIRECTORY,)
LOCATIONAND ORIENTATION)
SYSTEM FOR RETAIL STORES AND)
THE LIKE) Date: July 11, 2008

RESPONSE

MAIL STOP RCE
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

Sir:

The most recent and final Office Action dated December 13, 2007, correctly identifies that claims 5 to 8 and 10 to 27 currently are pending, with claims 5 to 8 and 10 to 16 withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to a non-elected invention. The final Action also includes a rejection of claims 17 to 27 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Ramey (U.S. Patent No. 5,297,685, hereinafter “Ramey”) in view of Begum et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,012,244, hereinafter “Begum”), the Porter et al. article, “The influence of brand recognition on retail store image,” The Journal of Product and Brand Management, Santa Barbara, 1997, Vol. 6, No. 6, page 373 (hereinafter, “Porter”), and Official Notice taken by the Examiner. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks:

In response to Applicant’s arguments presented on pages 10 to 18 of the Amendment dated September 21, 2007, the Office asserts on page 12, section 4 of the final Action that these arguments are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. It is respectfully submitted, however, that the new rejection does not render independent claim 17 obvious, and thus also claims 18 to 27. Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant’s arguments of record remain relevant, and thus are not moot.